

Application Serial No: 10/580,815
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: July 21, 2009

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 21, 2009. Claims 1-13, 15-21, 23-32, 33, 35, 37 and 41 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to include features of claim 36. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 18, 20, 26, 32, 33, 35, 37 and 41 are amended for clarity and to fix minor typographical errors. Claim 8 is amended to include features of claim 45. Claim 15 is amended to include features of claims 36 and 45. Claim 15 is further amended to remove features to become a generic linking claim. Claims 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-25 and 27-31 are amended to track claim 15. Claims 16 and 17 are also amended to include features of claim 15. Claims 36, 42-49, 52-54 and 57-59 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Claims 1-35, 37-41, 50, 51, 55, 56 are pending with claims 15-30, 41, 51 and 56 being withdrawn.

§103 Rejections:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 31-33, 38 and 39 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ishii (US Patent No. 6,311,638) in view of Kuriyama (WO No. 03/037047). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to include the features of allowable claim 36, except for reference to a "user". However, Applicants note that the "user" does not form part of the claimed power supply system, and therefore these amended features of claim 1 should remain allowable over the cited prior art.

Moreover, Applicants note that Ishii and Kuriyama, as well as the other cited prior art, do not teach or suggest a determination prevention unit for preventing the anomaly determiner from performing a determining operation upon commencement of a power supply operation of the high-frequency power source or upon a change made on an output power value setting during the power supply operation, until a predetermined time period has passed.

For at least these reasons claim 1 is not suggested by the combination of Ishii and Kuriyama and should be allowed. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 31-33, 38 and 39 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Application Serial No: 10/580,815
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: July 21, 2009

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Kuriyama and further in view of Edamura (JP No. 2003-173973). This rejection is traversed. Claims 3 and 6 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons discussed above. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 40, 50 and 55 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Kuriyama and further in view of Hayashi (US Publication No. 2002/0188367). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 8 is amended to include the features of allowable claim 45, except for reference to a "user". However, Applicants note that the "user" does not form part of the claimed power supply system, and therefore these amended features of claim 8 should remain allowable over the cited prior art.

Moreover, Applicants note that Ishii, Kuriyama, and Hayashi, as well as the other cited prior art, do not teach or suggest a determination prevention unit for preventing the anomaly determiner from performing a determining operation upon commencement of a power supply operation of the high-frequency power source or upon a change made on an output power value setting during the power supply operation, until a predetermined time period has passed.

For at least these reasons claim 8 is not suggested by the combination of Ishii and Kuriyama and should be allowed. Claims 9, 11, 12, 14, 40, 50 and 55 depend from claim 8 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Kuriyama and in view of Hayashi and further in view of Edamura. This rejection is traversed. Claims 10 and 13 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons discussed above. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 15-30, 41, 51 and 56:

Applicants note that claims 15-30, 41, 51 and 56 are neither rejected nor withdrawn in the current Office Action, particularly in the Office Action Summary.

Application Serial No: 10/580,815
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: July 21, 2009

Applicants believe this is an inadvertent error, and that these claims are withdrawn based on Applicants' election of Species I and Species II in response to the April 9, 2009 Restriction Requirement.

Applicants further note that claim 15 is amended to become a generic linking claim and is also amended to include the features of claims 36 and 45 now amended into claims 1 and 8, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reinstatement of claim 15 and claims 16-30, 41, 51 and 56 which depend from claim 15.

Moreover, Applicants note that Ishii, Kuriyama, Hayashi and Edamura do not teach or suggest a determination prevention unit for preventing the anomaly determiner from performing a determining operation upon commencement of a power supply operation of the high-frequency power source or upon a change made on an output power value setting during the power supply operation, until a predetermined time period has passed.

For at least these reasons claim 15 is not suggested by the combination of Ishii and Kuriyama and should be allowed. Claims 16-30, 41, 51 and 56 depend from claim 15 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: January 21, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443
JAL/ahk